arXiv:1504.00103v2 [math.OA] 8 Sep 2015

On Pimsner Popa bases

Keshab Chandra Bakshi
The Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Taramani, Chennai 600113,
INDIA
email: keshabcb@imsc.res.in

Abstract

In this paper we examine bases for finite index inclusion of II_1 factors and connected inclusion of finite dimensional C^*- algebras. These bases behave nicely with respect to basic construction towers. As applications we have studied automorphisms of the hyperfinite II_1 factor R which are 'compatible with respect to the Jones' tower of finite dimensional C^*-algebras'. As a further application, in both Cases we obtain a characterization, in terms of bases, of basic constructions. Finally we use these bases to describe the phenomenon of multistep basic constructions (in both the Cases).

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 46L37

Keywords: Subfactor; basic construction;connected inclusion; Pimsner-Popa bases.

1 Introduction

We write $(N \subseteq M, tr)$ to denote a unital inclusion of finite von Neumann algebras, with 'tr' a faithful normal tracial state, and write $N \subset M \overset{e_1}{\subset} M_1$ for Jones' resulting basic construction. The trace tr is called a *Markov trace of modulus* τ if it extends to a positive trace $Tr : M_1 \longmapsto \mathbb{C}$ such that $Tr(xe_n) = \tau tr(x)$ for $x \in M$.

We confine ourselves to two Cases: (1) when the inclusion is one of II_1 factors with finite index, i.e., $[M : N] < \infty$; and (2) when we have a connected inclusion of finite dimensional C^*- algebras. Then it is known that in both Cases ((1) and (2)) there exists a unique Markov trace on M, and we can iterate the basic construction to obtain a tower,

$$M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq .. \subseteq M_n \subseteq M_{n+1} ....$$

where $M_{n+1} = \langle M_n, e_{n+1} \rangle$ is the result of applying the basic construction for the pair $M_{n-1} \subseteq M_n$ and e_{n+1} is the projection implementing the tr_{M_n} preserving conditional expectation of M_n onto

M_{n-1}. We then obtain a II_1 factor M_∞ in both the Cases, which is hyperfinite in Case (2).

Pimsner and Popa have shown (in [11]) that for an inclusion $N \subset M$ of II_1 factors, M is a finitely generated projective module over N if and only if $[M : N]$ is finite by constructing a family $\{m_j : 1 \leq j \leq n+1\}$ of elements in M, with n equal to the integer part of $[M : N]$, which they called "orthonormal basis" for the pair $N \subseteq M$. In a similar manner, we find a slightly less restrictive notion of basis in [7].

In this paper (in section 2) we see that this notion of basis in [7] can also be carried out in our Case (2) of connected inclusions of finite dimensional C^*- algebras. Further in section 2 we characterize bases, in both Cases (1) and (2), by three equivalent conditions. One advantage of this characterization is a transparent proof of Corollary 2.7. This result has been mentioned for the Case of II_1 factors in [7] (Lemma 4.3.4 (i)), but the proof there seems incomplete. Our characterization of bases now clarifies this point, and also shows that bases behave in a nice way with respect to the Jones' tower.

As an application we show (in 3.1) how the use of bases leads to a natural proof of existence, in Case (2), (see [13](Theorem 2.1)) of a unique extension of an automorphism on M which leaves N globally invariant, to an automorphism on the hyperfinite II_1 factor M_∞ which is compatible with the tower in the sense of fixing the Jones projections. It has been also proved that the initial automorphism will be automatically trace-preserving.

In [12](Proposition 1.2) Pimsner and Popa have characterized basic construction for II_1 factor inclusion in two equivalent ways. See also [4](section 5). In this paper we have characterized basic construction in terms of basis we introduced(Lemma 3.4). We have succeeded to obtain a simple characterization of M_1 for finite demensional C^*- algebra Case also. In [12](Theorem 2.6)Pimsner and Popa have used their characterization of basic construction to describe the k-th step of the basic construction. In the section 3.2 we have also given another proof of this construction using our characterization of basic construction and have also done the same for connected inclusion of finite dimensional C^*-algebras.

2 Bases

As stated in the Introduction, we assume $N \subseteq M$ is a unital inclusion of finite von Neumann algebras of one of the following two types.

$\mathcal{C}ase(1)$: N and M are II_1 factors with finite index $[M:N]$ and hence there exists unique Markov trace tr on M of modulus τ where $\tau = [M:N]^{-1}$.

$\mathcal{C}ase(2)$: Let $N \subseteq M$ be a connected inclusion of finite dimensional C^* -algebras and hence there exists unique Markov trace tr on M of modulus τ where $\tau = \|G\|^{-2}$ where G is the inclusion matrix for $N \subseteq M$.

For both the Cases the following easy but very useful Lemma holds whose proof can be found in [11], (Lemma 1.2) and for Case(2) see [7] (Remark 4.3.2(a)).

LEMMA 2.1. *If $x_1 \in M_1$, then there exists unique element $x_0 \in M$ such that $x_1e_1 = x_0e_1$,this element is given by $x_0 = \tau^{-1}E_M(x_1e_1)$.*

In the following theorem we give three equivalent descriptions of basis, not necessarily orthonormal in the sense of Pimsner-Popa.

THEOREM 2.2. *Let N and M be as in Case(1) or in Case(2). Then for a finite set $\{\lambda_i : i \in I = 1,2,...n\} \subseteq M$, the following are equivalent:*

(1) Let E_N be the tr- preserving conditional expectation of M onto N and define a matrix Q whose (i,j) entry is given by $q_{ij} = E_N(\lambda_i {\lambda_j}^*)$. Then Q is a projection in $M_n(N)$ such that $tr_{M_n(N)}(Q) = \tau^{-1}/n$.

(2) $\sum_{i=1}^{n} {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i = 1$, *where e_1 is the Jones projection.*

(3) For any $x \in M$, $x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_N(x{\lambda_i}^*)\lambda_i$.

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2) : This proof is mainly inspired by [11]. Assume (1) holds. Since tr on M is Markov, it extends to a unique trace on M_1, namely tr_{M_1}. Put $v_i = e_1\lambda_i$ and

$$v = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ v_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ v_n & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, $v_i{v_j}^* = e_1\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*e_1 = E_N(\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*)e_1 = q_{ij}e_1$. Thus,

$$vv^* = \begin{bmatrix} q_{11}e_1 & q_{12}e_1 & \dots & q_{1n}e_1 \\ q_{21}e_1 & q_{22}e_1 & \dots & q_{2n}e_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_{n1}e_1 & q_{n2}e_1 & \dots & q_{nn}e_1 \end{bmatrix} = QE$$

where

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & e_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & e_1 \end{bmatrix} .$$

Thus by property of Jones projection [5] (Proposition 3.1.4), $vv^* = QE = EQ$ and hence v is a partial isometry. Thus v^*v is a projection; i.e., $\sum_i v_i^* v_i$ is a projection f (say) in $\langle M, e_1 \rangle = M_1$. But $f = \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i$ satisfies the following equations :

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{M_1} f &= n\ tr_{M_n(M_1)}\ (vv^*) \\ &= n\ tr_{M_n(M_1)}(QE) \\ &= n\ (1/n) \sum_i tr_{M_1}(q_{ii} e_1) \\ &= \sum_i \tau\ tr(q_{ii}) \qquad\qquad \text{(Markov property)} \\ &= \tau\ n\ tr_{M_n(N)}(Q) \\ &= 1 \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{(by (1))}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(1 - f) \geq 0$ and $tr_{M_1}(f) = 1$. Then faithfulness of tr implies $f = 1$. So $\sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i = 1$. Thus (1) implies (2).

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3): We assume that (2) holds. Let $x^* \in M$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x^* e_1 &= (\sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i) x^* e_1 \\ &= \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* E_N(\lambda_i x^*) e_1 \\ &= (\sum_i {\lambda_i}^* E_N(\lambda_i x^*)) e_1. \end{aligned}$$

Again applying Lemma 2.1 and then taking adjoint we get (3).

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) : We assume (3). Let x and y be two arbitrary elements of M. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i)(x e_1 y) &= \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i x e_1 y \\ &= \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* E_N(\lambda_i x) e_1 y \\ &= (x e_1 y) \qquad\qquad \text{(by (3))}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}(xe_1y)(\sum_i {\lambda_i}^*e_1\lambda_i) &= \sum_i xe_1y{\lambda_i}^*e_1\lambda_i \\ &= \sum_i xe_1E_N(y{\lambda_i}^*)\lambda_i \\ &= (xe_1y) \qquad\qquad \text{(by (3))}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we know the space Me_1M, which is linear span of $\{xe_1y : x, y \in M\}$, is a strongly dense *-subalgebra of M_1, see for instance [2](Proposition 3.6.1(vii)). Then since multiplication is separately strongly continuous it follows that $\sum_i {\lambda_i}^*e_1\lambda_i = 1$.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) : Suppose (2) is true. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}e_1(\sum_k q_{ik}q_{kj}) &= e_1(\sum_k E_N(\lambda_i{\lambda_k}^*)E_N(\lambda_k{\lambda_j}^*)) \\ &= e_1(\sum_k E_N(\lambda_i{\lambda_k}^*E_N(\lambda_k{\lambda_j}^*))) \\ &= \sum_k e_1\lambda_i{\lambda_k}^*E_N(\lambda_k{\lambda_j}^*)e_1 \\ &= \sum_k e_1\lambda_i{\lambda_k}^*e_1\lambda_k{\lambda_j}^*e_1 \\ &= e_1\lambda_i(\sum_k {\lambda_k}^*e_1\lambda_k){\lambda_j}^*e_1 \\ &= e_1\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*e_1 \qquad\qquad \text{(by (2))} \\ &= e_1E_N(\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*) \\ &= e_1q_{ij}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus applying Lemma 2.1 we get $Q^2 = Q$. Clearly $Q^* = Q$. Hence Q is a projection in $M_n(N)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}tr_{M_n(N)}(Q) &= (1/n)\sum_i tr(q_{ii}) \\ &= (1/n)\sum_i tr(E_N(\lambda_i{\lambda_i}^*)) \\ &= (1/n)\sum_i tr(\lambda_i{\lambda_i}^*) \\ &= (\tau^{-1}/n)\sum_i tr(e_1\lambda_i{\lambda_i}^*) \quad \text{(Markov Property)} \\ &= (\tau^{-1}/n)\sum_i tr({\lambda_i}^*e_1\lambda_i) \\ &= (\tau^{-1}/n).\end{aligned}$$

Hence (2) implies (1).

$\square$

Remark 2.3. *Taking adjoints in (3) it follows that the above three are also equivalent to* $x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} {\lambda_i}^* E_N(\lambda_i x)$, *for all* $x \in M$.

Definition 2.4. *A finite set* $\{\lambda_i : i \in I\} \subset M$ *satisfying any one of the equivalent conditions (i)-(iii) of Theorem 2.2 will simply be called a* **basis** *for* M/N.

Existence of bases: For Case(1) an explicit construction has been given in [11](Proposition 1.3) while for Case (2) see [7] (Lemma 5.7.3), and [6] (Proposition 2.5). For Case(2) see also [1](section 9.4).

Remark 2.5. *Comparing [11] (Proposition 1.3(c)(2)) and Theorem 2.2 we remark that any Pimsner-Popa basis for* II_1 *factor inclusions is automatically a basis according to our notion. Also, motivated by [11] and [9], Watatani has introduced (in the memoir [15]) what he calls 'quasi-basis for conditional expectation E' in a purely algebraic setting. Assuming the existence of quasi-basis he developed index for a conditional expectation of index-finite type, called it Index E, which he shows to be independent of the choice of quasi-basis. He then investigated Jones' index theory in* C^**-algebra setting. Observe that, Theorem 2.2 (1) now says that Index E is same as Jones' index for Case (1) and equals to* $\|G\|^2$ *for Case (2).*

Remark 2.6. *The row vector* $[E_N(x{\lambda_1}^*), .., E_N(x{\lambda_n}^*)] \in M_{1\times n}(N)Q$ *and conversely if* $[x_1, .., x_n] \in M_{1\times n}(N)Q$ *satisfies* $x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\lambda_i$ *then* $x_j = E_N(x{\lambda_j}^*)$ *for all* $j \in I$.

Exactly the same proof as in [7] (Proposition 4.3.3(b)(ii)) works.

Corollary 2.7. *Let* $N \subseteq M \subseteq P$ *be a tower of* II_1 *factors with* $[P : N] < \infty$ *(or a tower of finite dimensional* C^**-algebras where the two inclusions are connected with inclusion matrices G and H respectively). In either Case, let* $\{\lambda_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ *be a basis for* M/N *and* $\{\mu_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ *be a basis for* P/M, *then* $\{\lambda_i\mu_j : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ *is a basis for* P/N.

Proof. Let $x \in P$ and as $\{\mu_j\}$ is a basis for P/M, we get, $x = \sum_{j=1}^{n} E_M(x{\mu_j}^*)\mu_j$. Now note $E_M(x{\mu_j}^*) \in M$ and $\{\lambda_i\}$ is a basis for M/N. Now condition(3) of the Theorem 2.2 yields,

$$E_M(x{\mu_j}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} E_N\{E_M(x{\mu_j}^*){\lambda_i}^*\}\lambda_i.$$

Thus we get,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}[\sum_{i=1}^{m} E_N\{E_M(x{\mu_j}^*){\lambda_i}^*\}\lambda_i]\mu_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} E_N\{E_M(x{\mu_j}^*{\lambda_i}^*)\}\lambda_i\mu_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus again applying (3) of the Theorem 2.2 we get that
$\{\lambda_i\mu_j : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ is a basis for P/N. $\square$

Corollary 2.8. *If* $\{\lambda_i : i \in I = \{1, 2, ...n\}\}$ *is a basis for* M/N*, then* $\{\tau^{-1/2}e_1\lambda_i\}$ *is a basis for* M_1/M*. Where* $N \subseteq M$ *is an in inclusion as in Case (1) or Case (2).*

Proof. In the Case (1) M_1 is a II_1 factor such that $[M_1 : M] = [M : N] < \infty$. In Case (2) inclusion matrix for $M \subseteq M_1$ is G^t and hence is a connected inclusion. Now in both the Cases let e_2 be the Jones projection for the inclusion $M \subseteq M_1$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\{\tau^{-1/2}e_1\lambda_i\}^* e_2\{\tau^{-1/2}e_1\lambda_i\} &= \tau^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}{\lambda_i}^* e_1 e_2 e_1\lambda_i \\ &= \tau^{-1}\tau\sum_{i=1}^{n}{\lambda_i}^* e_1\lambda_i \\ &= 1 \quad \text{(since } \{\lambda_i\} \text{ is a basis).} \end{aligned}$$

Now (2) of the Theorem 2.2 yields the result. $\square$

Remark 2.9. *From Corollary 2.8 every element of* M_1 *is expressible in the form* $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i e_1 y_i$ *for some* $x_i, y_i \in M$ *(in fact,* $x = \tau^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} E_M(x\lambda_i^* e_1)e_1\lambda_i$*); however this does not allow us to define a *-homomorphism on* M_1 *by merely specifying the image of an element of the form* xe_1y*, as we will need to verify that such a 'definition' is unambiguous; but we may define the above canonical decomposition to unambiguously define maps on* M_1 *once we know where to map elements of* N*, the basis vectors* λ_i *and* e_1*. This problem of ambiguity was part of the reason for us the study this notion of bases. The reader need only compare the crisp clarity of the proofs of unambiguity in the definition of* α_1 *in Theorem 3.2 and of* ϕ *in Lemma 3.4 with the corresponding proofs of Theorem 2.1 in [13] (actually only to be found in the arXiv version) and of Proposition 1.2 in [12], to appreciate this remark.*

COROLLARY 2.10. *Let* $N \subseteq M$ *as in Case (1) or (2) and* $\{\lambda_i : i \in I\}$ *be a basis for* M/N. *Define* $\widehat{i(k)} = (i_1, i_2, ...i_k) \in I^k, k \geqslant 1$ *and* $\lambda_{\widehat{i(k)}} = \tau^{-k(k-1)/4}\lambda_{i_1}e_1\lambda_{i_2}e_2e_1\lambda_{i_3}.....\lambda_{i_{k-1}}e_{k-1}.....e_1\lambda_{i_k}$. *Then* $\{\lambda_{\widehat{i(k)}} : \widehat{i(k)} \in I^k\}$ *is a basis for* M_{k-1}/N.

Proof. Clearly the statement is true for $k = 1$ with the understanding that $M_0 = M$. Suppose the statement is true for k. Now applying Corollary 2.8 recursively we get M_k/M_{k-1} has basis $\{\tau^{-k/2}e_ke_{k-1}..e_1\lambda_{i_{k+1}} : i_{k+1} \in I\}$. Then applying Corollary 2.7 we see that M_k/N has basis,
$\{\tau^{-k(k-1)/4}\tau^{-k/2}\lambda_{i_1}e_1\lambda_{i_2}e_2e_1\lambda_{i_3}..\lambda_{i_{k-1}}e_{k-1}..e_1\lambda_{i_k}e_ke_{k-1}..e_1\lambda_{i_{k+1}}\}$
$= \{\lambda_{\widehat{i(k+1)}} : \widehat{i(k+1)} \in I^{k+1}\}$; and the proof of the inductive step is complete. □

3 Applications

3.1 Compatible automorphisms of the Hyperfinite II_1 factor

Consider an inclusion as in Case (2). Then, we have a unique Markov trace tr on M. Next consider the Jones tower $N \subseteq M \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq .....$ and let R be the hyperfinite II_1 factor arising from this tower [7]. Suppose further we have an automorphism α_0 on M such that $\alpha_0(N) = N$. In this present section we shall show using our concept of basis how we can costruct a unique extension of α_0 to an automorphism α of the hyperfinite II_1 factor R which is compatible with respect to the tower in the sense of fixing all the Jones projections and leaving M_i invariant.

This can be thought of as the finite dimensional C^*-algebraic version of [10] (Lemma 5.1). In that paper Loi studied automorphisms for a pair of factors using standard form of von Neumann algebras, whereas our treatment is based on basis for the corresponding inclusion. In the similar direction in [8] the author has dealt with automorphisms commuting with a faithful normal conditional expectation for a pair of σ-finite von Neumann algebras and related this with an action of a locally compact abelian group. See also [14], where the author was more concerned with commuting squares.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let* N, M, tr, α_0 *be as above.Then* α_0 *is automatically trace preserving, that is* $tr \circ \alpha_0 = tr$.

Proof. Let the minimal central projections in N be $\{p_1, p_2, ...p_m\}$ and those in M be $\{q_1, q_2, ...q_n\}$. Then the inclusion matrix G is an

$m \times n$ matrix. Observe α_0 permutes p_i's and q_j's. Say $p_i \mapsto p_{\tau(i)}$ and $q_j \mapsto q_{\sigma(j)}$ for $\tau \in \Sigma_m$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$. As α_0 is an automorphism,$G(i,j) = G(\tau(i), \sigma(j))$. Equivalently, $G = TGS$ for permutation matrices T and S of sizes m and n respectively. Let $\vec{t}$ be the trace vector corresponding to tr for M. Then it is the unique positive Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of G^tG, hence also of $S^{-1}G^tGS$. But that implies $S\vec{t}$ is a positive eigenvector of G^tG with the same eigenvalue as of $\vec{t}$ and by uniqueness of Perron -Frobenius theory(see chapter XIII [3])we get $S\vec{t} = \vec{t}$. Hence $tr \circ \alpha_0 = tr$. □

The above proof is due to Vijay Kodiyalam. I sincerely thank him for this.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let α_0 be an automorphism of M such that $\alpha_0(N) = N$. Then there is a unique (trace preserving) automorphism α_1 of M_1 such that $\alpha_1(e_1) = e_1$, $\alpha_1(M) = M$ and the restriction of α_1 to M is α_0.*

Proof. We know there is a basis for M/N. Fix such a basis $\{\lambda_i : i \in I\}$. Then we show $\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i) : i \in I\}$ is also a basis for M/N. Let Q_1 be the matrix with (i,j) entry given by $q_1(i,j) = E_N\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*)\}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{M_n(N)}(Q_1) &= (1/n)\sum_{i\in I} tr(q_1(i,i)) \\
&= (1/n)\sum_{i\in I} tr[E_N\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*)\}] \\
&= (1/n)\sum_{i\in I} tr(\lambda_i{\lambda_j}^*) \qquad\qquad \text{(by Lemma (3.1))} \\
&= tr_{M_n(N)}Q.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from the Theorem 2.2, that $\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i)\}$ is a basis for M/N. Observe since α_0 leaves N invariant it follows that $E_N(\alpha_0(x)) = \alpha_0(E_N(x))$. Let $x \in M_1$, Corollary 2.8 then implies

$$x = \sum_{i\in I} \tau^{-1} E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1)e_1\lambda_i.$$

Then define,

$$\alpha_1(x) = \tau^{-1}\sum_{i\in I} \alpha_0(E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1))e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i).$$

There is clearly no ambiguity in the definition of α_1. Next we show that α_1 is a homomorphism. Consider $y \in M_1$. Now using the properties of Jones' projection and the fact that α_0 is a homomorphism we get the following series of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_1(x)\alpha_1(y)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1)] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i) \alpha_0[E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1)] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_j)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1)] E_N(\alpha_0[\lambda_i E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1)]) e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_j)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1) E_N(\lambda_i E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1))] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_j)\\
&\qquad \text{(since } \alpha_0 \text{ and } E_N \text{ commute)}\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M\{x{\lambda_i}^* e_1 E_N(\lambda_i E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1))\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_j)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{j} \alpha_0[E_M\{x E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1) e_1\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_j) \qquad (1)\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{(since } \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1 \lambda_i = 1\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_1(xy)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-1} \sum_{i} \alpha_0[E_M(xy{\lambda_i}^* e_1)] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-1} \sum_{i} \alpha_0[E_M\{x(\sum_j \tau^{-1} E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1) e_1 \lambda_j){\lambda_i}^* e_1\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M\{x E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1) E_N(\lambda_j {\lambda_i}^*) e_1\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_0[E_M\{x E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1 E_N(\lambda_j {\lambda_i}^*)) e_1\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i)\\
&\quad = \tau^{-2} \sum_{i} \alpha_0[E_M\{x E_M(y{\lambda_i}^* e_1) e_1\}] e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i) \qquad (2)\\
&\qquad\qquad \text{(since } \sum_j {\lambda_j}^* e_1 \lambda_j = 1\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now comparing equations (1) and (2) we conclude that α_1 is indeed a homomorphism. Next we show α_1 fixes e_1. Observe,

$$e_1 = \tau^{-1} \sum_i E_M(e_1 {\lambda_i}^* e_1) e_1 \lambda_i.$$

Now using our definition of α_1 and property of Jones' projection it is easy to see that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1(e_1) &= \tau^{-1}\sum_i \alpha_0[E_M\{E_N({\lambda_i}^*)e_1\}]e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \\
&= \sum_i \alpha_0(E_N({\lambda_i}^*))e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \\
&= \sum_i E_N(\alpha_0({\lambda_i}^*))e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \qquad \text{(as } E_N \text{ and } \alpha_0 \text{ commute)} \\
&= \sum_i e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i)^* e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \\
&= e_1.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equation we have used the fact that $\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i)\}$ is a basis for M/N.

Next we will show that α_1 agrees with α_0 when it is restricted to M. Now, since α_0 is a automorphism for $x \in M$ we find that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1(x) &= \tau^{-1}\sum_i \alpha_0\{E_M(x{\lambda_i}^*e_1\}e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \\
&= \sum_i \alpha_0(x{\lambda_i}^*)E_M(e_1)e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \\
&= \sum_i \alpha_0(x)\alpha_0(\lambda_i)^* e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i) \qquad \text{(since } E_M(e_1) = \tau) \\
&= \alpha_0(x) \qquad\qquad \text{(as } \{\alpha_0(\lambda_i)\} \text{ is a basis for } M/N).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we want to show that α_1 is onto.

Let $y \in M_1$. Then, $y = \sum_i y_i e_1 \alpha_0(\lambda_i)$, since $\alpha_0(\lambda_i)$ is a basis for M/N. As, α_0 is an automorphism there is a unique $x_i \in M$ such that $\alpha_0(x_i) = y_i$. Put $x = \sum_i x_i e_1 \lambda_i$. Then x belongs to M_1. Now as we have already proved that α_1 is a homomrphism which preserves e_1 and agree with α_0 when restricted to M it follows trivially that $\alpha_1(x) = y$. Thus α_1 is onto.

Lastly we show α_1 is one-one. Observe, α_1 is *-preserving, since if $x = \sum_i x_i e_1 \lambda_i$ we find, exactly as above, that

$$\alpha_1(x^*) = \sum_i \alpha_1(\lambda_i)^* e_1 \alpha_1(x_i)^* = \{\sum_i \alpha_1(x_i)e_1\alpha_1(\lambda_i)\}^* = \alpha_1(x)^*.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
tr(\alpha_1(x)) &= tr(\sum_i \alpha_0(x_i)e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i)) \\
&= \sum_i tr\{e_1\alpha_0(\lambda_i)\alpha_0(x_i)\} \\
&= \tau\sum_i tr\{\alpha_0(\lambda_i x_i)\} \qquad \text{(Markov property)} \\
&= \tau\sum_i tr(\lambda_i x_i) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 3.1)} \\
&= \sum_i tr(x_i e_1 \lambda_i) \qquad \text{(Markov property)} \\
&= tr(x).
\end{aligned}$$

so α_1 is tr-preserving and hence one-one. The uniqueness assertion is obvious since M and e_1 generate M_1. Thus α_1 satisfies all the properties mentioned in the Theorem. □

COROLLARY 3.3. *Let α_0 be as in the previous theorem. Then there is a unique (trace preserving) automorphism α of the hyperfinite II_1 factor R such that $\alpha(e_i) = e_i, \alpha(M_i) = M_i$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $\alpha|M = \alpha_0$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.2 recursively for the tower of basic construction to get a unique (trace preserving) automorphism α_i on M_i which leaves M_j invariant and fixes all e_j such that $1 \leq j \leq i$ and $\alpha_i|M_j = \alpha_j$. Thus we can define an automorphism(compatible with respect to the tower) α_∞ on $\cup_i M_i$ by, $\alpha_\infty(x) = \alpha_j(x)$ for $x \in M_j$. Now as α_∞ is bounded it extends to trace preserving automorphism α (say) on R. Also since M_1 and e_i s generate R uniqueness is straightforward. □

3.2 Iterating basic construction

The following gives a characterization of basic construction using bases, in both Case(1) and Case(2). This would be needed for our proof of the assertion regarding k-th step basic constructions.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $N \subseteq M$ be as in Case(1) or Case(2). Assume $\{\lambda_i : i \in \{1, 2, ..n\}\}$ is a basis for M/N(which exists in both the Cases). Let P be a II_1 factor in Case(1) or a finite dimensional C^*-algebra in Case (2) such that P contains M and also contains* *a projection* f *such that* $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i{}^* f \lambda_i = 1$ *and satisfies further the following two properties :*

1)$fxf = E_N(x)f$ *for all* $x \in M$ *and*

2)$\{\tau^{-1/2} f\lambda_i\}$ *is a basis for* P/M.

In addition for Case(2) P *satisfies the following property also:*

3) $n \longmapsto nf$ *is an injective map from* N *into* P.

Then there exists an isomorphism from $M_1 = \langle M, e_1 \rangle$ *onto* P *which maps* e_1 *to* f.

In this situation we say that P is an instance of basic construction applied to the inclusion $N \subseteq M$ with a choice of projection implementing the conditional expectation being given by f.

Proof. $\mathcal{C}ase1$: Let $x \in M_1$. Now from Corollary 2.8 it follows that

$$x = \sum_i \tau^{-1/2} E_M(x\tau^{-1/2} \lambda_i{}^* e_1) e_1 \lambda_i.$$

Put $a_i = \tau^{-1} E_M(x\lambda_i{}^* e_1)$, then define a map $\phi : M_1 \mapsto P$ by $\phi(x) = \sum_i a_i f \lambda_i$, which is clearly well-defined. Note, if $y = \sum_i b_i e_1 \lambda_i$ such that $[b_1, b_2, ...b_n] \in M_{1\times n}(M)Q$, then by Remark 2.6 we conclude

$$\phi(y) = \sum_i b_i f \lambda_i. \tag{3.1}$$

Since, if Q_1 is the matrix whose $i - j$ th entry is given by $q_1(i,j) = E_M((\tau^{-1/2} e_1 \lambda_i)(\tau^{-1/2} e_1 \lambda_j)^*)$, then $q_1(i,j) = E_N(\lambda_i \lambda_j{}^*) = q_{ij}$. Now, let x be as above and let $y \in M_1$. Put $y = \sum_i b_i e_1 \lambda_i$ where $b_i = \tau^{-1} E_M(y\lambda_i{}^* e_1)$. Then the following equations follow from properties of Jones' projection,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(xy) &= \phi\{\sum_{i,j} a_i E_N(\lambda_i b_j) e_1 \lambda_j\} \\
&= \phi\{\sum_{i,j} \tau^{-1} E_M(x\lambda_i{}^* e_1) E_N(\lambda_i b_j) e_1 \lambda_j\} \\
&= \phi\{\sum_{i,j} \tau^{-1} E_M(x\lambda_i{}^* e_1 E_N(\lambda_i b_j)) e_1 \lambda_j\} \\
&= \phi\{\sum_{j} \tau^{-1} E_M(x b_j e_1) e_1 \lambda_j\} \quad (\text{since } \sum_i \lambda_i{}^* e_1 \lambda_i = 1) \\
&= \phi\{\sum_{j} \tau^{1} E_M[x\tau^{-1} E_M(y\lambda_j{}^* e_1) e_1] e_1 \lambda_j\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now it can be easily checked that,
$[\tau^{-1} E_M\{x\tau^{-1} E_M(y\lambda_1{}^* e_1) e_1\}, \tau^{-1} E_M\{x\tau^{-1} E_M(y\lambda_2{}^* e_1) e_1\}, ...,$
$\tau^{-1} E_M\{x\tau^{-1} E_M(y\lambda_n{}^* e_1) e_1\}] \in M_{1\times n}(M)Q.$

Thus, it follows from equation(3.1) that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(xy) &= \sum_j \tau^{-1} E_M[x\tau^{-1}E_M(y{\lambda_j}^* e_1)e_1]f\lambda_j \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \tau^{-1} E_M(a_i e_1 \lambda_i b_j e_1) f\lambda_j \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \tau^{-1} a_i E_M(E_N(\lambda_i b_j) e_1) f\lambda_j \\
&= \sum_{i,j} a_i E_N(\lambda_i b_j) f\lambda_j \\
&= \sum_{i,j} a_i f\lambda_i b_j f\lambda_j \qquad \text{(by assumption (1))} \\
&= \phi(x)\phi(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(e_1) &= \tau^{-1} \sum_i E_M(e_1 {\lambda_i}^* e_1) f\lambda_i \\
&= \sum_i E_N({\lambda_i}^*) f\lambda_i \qquad \text{(since } E_M(e_1) = \tau\text{)} \\
&= \sum_i f{\lambda_i}^* f\lambda_i \qquad \text{(by assunption (1))} \\
&= f \qquad \text{(since, } \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* f\lambda_i = 1\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus ϕ is a nonzero homomorphism. Now assume, $x \in M$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(x) &= \sum_i \tau^{-1} E_M(x{\lambda_i}^* e_1) f\lambda_i \\
&= \sum_i x{\lambda_i}^* f\lambda_i \qquad \text{(since } x{\lambda_i}^* \in M\text{)} \\
&= x.
\end{aligned}$$

ϕ is also *-preserving, as, if $x = \sum_i a_i e_1 \lambda_i$ is any element of M_1, then the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\{\sum_i a_i e_1 \lambda_i\}^*) &= \sum_i {\lambda_i}^* f {a_i}^* \qquad \text{(since } \phi(e_1) = f \text{ and } \phi|_M = id\text{)} \\
&= \{\sum_i a_i f\lambda_i\}^* \\
&= \{\phi(\sum_i a_i e_1 \lambda_i)\}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\phi(x^*) = \phi(x)^*$.
Since we are now in a factor ϕ is automatically injective.
Finally we show ϕ is onto. For this purpose assume $z \in P$, assumption(2) then implies $z = \sum_i c_i f \lambda_i$ for some $c_i \in M$. Put, $y = \sum_i c_i e_1 \lambda_i$ which belongs to M_1 and since ϕ is a homomorphism sending e_1 to f and whose restriction to M is identity, we clearly get $\phi(y) = z$, proving onto. Thus ϕ is an isomorphism satisfying all the conditions stated in the Lemma.

$\mathcal{C}ase2$: Note assumption(2) implies $P = MfM$. Also this together with assumption(1) imply that $PfP = MfM$. Thus $P = PfP$ which forces $Z_P(f) = 1$. Now just applying Corollary 5.3.2 in [7] we get the result.

This completes the Lemma.

$\square$

Now we give another proof of k-th step basic construction for an inclusion of II_1 factors using basis and also we show it can be done for Case(2).

THEOREM 3.5. *Let $N \subseteq M$ be a pair of von Neumann algebras as in Case(1) or (2) and $N \subseteq M \subseteq M_1 \subseteq .....$ be the tower of II_1 factors (or finite dimensional C^*-algebras)in Case(1) (or in Case(2) respectively) which can be obtained by iterating basic construction. Let $e_i \in M_i$ be the Jones' projections. Then for $m \geq 0, k \geq -1$, $M_k \subseteq M_{k+m} \subseteq M_{k+2m}$ is an instance of basic construction with a choice of projection implementing the conditional expectation of M_{k+m} onto M_k is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} &e_{[k,k+m]} \\ &\quad = \tau^{-m(m-1)/2}(e_{k+m+1}e_{k+m}...e_{k+2})(e_{k+m+2}e_{k+m+1}...e_{k+3}) \\ &\qquad ...(e_{k+2m}e_{k+2m-1}....e_{k+m+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we shall prove that $M_{-1} \subseteq M_n \subseteq M_{2n+1}$ is an instance of basic construction with $e_{[-1,n]}$ is the required projection. Assume $\{\lambda_i : i \in 1, 2, ..n\}$ is a basis for M/N(which exists in both the Cases). Now from Corollary 2.10 we know that $\{\lambda_{\widehat{i(n+1)}}\}$ is a basis for M_n/N.

Now applying Corollary 2.7 and Corollary 2.8 repeateadly we get M_{2n+1}/M_n has basis,

$$\tau^{-1/2\{(n+1)+(n+2)+..+(2n+1)\}}(e_{n+1}..e_1)\lambda_{i_1}(e_{n+2}..e_1)\times$$

$$\lambda_{i_2}.....(e_{2n}..e_1)\lambda_{i_n}(e_{2n+1}..e_1)\lambda_{i_{n+1}}.$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned}(e_{n+1}...e_1)\lambda_{i_1}(e_{n+2}..e_1)\lambda_{i_2}..(e_{2n+1}...e_1)\lambda_{i_{n+1}}\\ = (e_{n+1}..e_1)(e_{n+2}..e_2)(e_{n+3}..e_3)..(e_{2n+1}..e_{n+1})\\ \lambda_{i_1}e_1\lambda_{i_2}e_2e_1\lambda_{i_3}..\lambda_{i_n}e_n..e_1\lambda_{i_{n+1}}.\end{aligned}$$

In other words it shows that, M_{2n+1}/M_n has basis as, $\{\tau^{-(n+1)/2}e_{[-1,n]}\lambda_{\widehat{i(n+1)}}\}$.

Note, $[M_n : N] = [M : N]^{(n+1)} = \tau^{-(n+1)}$. Thus condition (2) of the Lemma 3.4 holds for factor Case.

To do the same for finite dimensional C^*-algebra we break this into two Cases.
$\mathcal{C}ase1$: Suppose n is odd. Then the inclusion matrix for $N \subseteq M$ would be $(GG^t)^k$ where $n = (2k-1)$. But it is easy to see that $\|(GG^t)^k\| = \|G\|^{2k} = \|G\|^{(n+1)} = \tau^{-(n+1)/2}$. Thus condition (2) of the Lemma 3.4 holds in this Case.
$\mathcal{C}ase2$: Here n is even $n = 2m$ (say). Then the inclusion matrix for $N \subseteq M$ would be $G(G^tG)^m$. Then we see, $\|G^tG(G^tG)^m\| \leq \|G^t\|\|G(G^tG)^m\| = \|G\|\|G(G^tG)^m\|$. Now applying the Case(1) in left hand side, we get that $\|G\|^{2m+1} \leq \|G(G^tG)^m\|$. The opposite inequality is obvious. Thus condition(2) of Lemma 3.4 holds in this Case also.
We need to show that , for all $k \geq 1$,(for both Cases),

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,....,i_k} \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(k)}}e_{[-1,k-1]}\lambda_{\widehat{i(k)}} = 1. \tag{3.2}$$

We prove it by induction over $k \geq 1$. It is easy to see that,

$$\lambda_{\widehat{i(n)}}(\tau^{-n/2}e_n..e_1\lambda_{i_{n+1}}) = \lambda_{\widehat{i(n+1)}}.$$

and hence,

$$(\tau^{-n/2}\lambda^*_{i_{n+1}}e_1...e_n)\lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n)}} = \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n+1)}}.$$

Suppose, as induction hypothesis, for $n \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{i_1,i_2,...,i_n} \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n)}}e_{[-1,n-1]}\lambda_{(\widehat{i(n)}} = 1. \tag{3.3}$$

Since $\sum_i {\lambda_i}^* e_1\lambda_i = 1$, we see that equation (3.2) holds for $k = 1$. Also we know, for $n \geq 1$,

$$e_{[-1,n]} = \tau^{-n}(e_{n+1}e_{n+2}...e_{2n+1})e_{[-1,n-1]}(e_{2n}e_{2n-1}..e_{n+1}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i_1,i_2,..,i_{n+1}} \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n+1)}} e_{[-1,n]} \lambda_{\widehat{i(n+1)}} \\
&\quad = \sum_{i_1,i_2,..i_{n+1}} \tau^{-2n} \lambda^*_{i_{n+1}} (e_1 e_2 ... e_n) \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n)}} (e_{n+1} e_{n+2} .. e_{2n+1}) e_{[-1,n-1]} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad (e_{2n} .. e_{n+1}) \lambda_{\widehat{i(n)}} (e_n e_{n-1} .. e_1) \lambda_{i_{n+1}} \\
&\quad = \sum_{i_1,i_2,,..i_{n+1}} \tau^{-2n} \lambda^*_{i_{n+1}} (e_1 e_2 .. e_n)(e_{n+1} .. e_{2n+1}) \lambda^*_{\widehat{i(n)}} e_{[-1,n-1]} \lambda_{\widehat{i(n)}} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad (e_{2n} e_{2n-1} .. e_{n+1})(e_n e_{n-1} .. e_1) \lambda_{i_{n+1}} \\
&\quad = \tau^{-2n} \sum_{i_{n+1}} \lambda^*_{i_{n+1}} (e_1 e_2 .... e_{2n+1})(e_{2n} e_{2n-1} ... e_1) \lambda_{i_{n+1}} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{[by equation (3.3)]} \\
&\quad = \sum_{i_{n+1}} \lambda^*_{i_{n+1}} e_1 \lambda_{i_{n+1}} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{[since } (e_1 e_2 .. e_{2n+1})(e_{2n} e_{2n-1} .. e_1) = \tau^{2n} e_1 \text{]} \\
&\quad = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second equation holds as $\lambda_{\widehat{i(n)}} \in M_{n-1}$ and $(e_{n+1}e_{n+2}..e_{2n+1})$, $(e_{2n}e_{2n-1}..e_{n+1})$ both commutes with M_{n-1}.

Hence the induction is complete.

Now we show property(1) of the Lemma 3.4.

As induction hypothesis, suppose,for $n \geq 0$,

$$e_{[-1,n]} x_n e_{[-1,n]} = E_N(x_n) e_{[-1,n]} \text{ for } x_n \in M_n.$$

It trivially holds for $n = 0$. Then, for $n \geq 0$,and for $x_{n+1} \in M_{n+1}$, we get the following array of equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e_{[-1,n+1]}x_{n+1}e_{[-1,n+1]}\\
&\quad= \tau^{-2(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\qquad\quad x_{n+1}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{-2(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+3})\\
&\qquad\quad E_{M_n}(x_{n+1})(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{-2(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+3})\\
&\qquad\quad (e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})E_{M_n}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{-2(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(\tau^{n}e_{2n+2}e_{2n+3})\\
&\qquad\quad E_{M_n}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{n}\tau^{-2(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+2})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+3}e_{2n+2}e_{2n+3})\\
&\qquad\quad E_{M_n}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{-(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}E_{M_n}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\quad= \tau^{-(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})E_{N}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2})\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{[Induction hypothesis]}\\
&\quad= E_{N}(x_{n+1})e_{[-1,n+1]}.
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth equation holds because of the almost trivial fact that

$$(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+3})(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3}) = \tau^{n}e_{2n+2}e_{2n+3}. \tag{3.4}$$

It should be mentioned that throughout we have used the fact that, for $n \geq 0$,

$$e_{[-1,n+1]} = \tau^{-(n+1)}(e_{n+2}..e_{2n+3})e_{[-1,n]}(e_{2n+2}..e_{n+2}).$$

This completes the induction.
Now using Lemma 3.4 we get the desired result for II_1 factor Case. For finite dimensional C^*- algebra the only remaining thing is to prove that the map $x \longmapsto xe_{[-1,n]}$ for $x \in N$ is injective. From Lemma 2.1 it follows that $xe_1 = 0$ implies $x = 0$ for $x \in N$, proving the above fact for $n = 0$. Suppose the statement is true for $(n-1)$, that is for $x \in N, xe_{[-1,n-1]} = 0$ implies $x = 0$. Let for $x \in N, xe_{[-1,n]} = 0$. Thus, $(\|xe_{[-1,n]}\|_2)^2 = tr(xe_{[-1,n]}x^*) = 0$. Note,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= tr(e_{[-1,n]}x^*x)\\
&= tr((e_{n+1}e_{n+2}..e_{2n+1})e_{[-1,n-1]}(e_{2n}..e_{n+1})x^*x)\\
&= tr(e_{[-1,n-1]}(e_{2n}..e_{n+1})(e_{n+1}..e_{2n+1})x^*x) \qquad \text{(since } x^*x \in N\text{)}\\
&= tr(e_{[-1,n-1]}(\tau^{n-1}e_{2n}e_{2n+1})x^*x). \qquad \text{(by equation(3.4))}
\end{aligned}$$

But as we know tr is Markov, we conclude from the last equation $tr(e_{[-1,n-1]}x^*x) = 0$, that is $tr(xe_{[-1,n-1]}x^*) = 0$. In other words,$xe_{[-1,n-1]} = 0$ and now from induction hypothesis we conclude $x = 0$. Hence the induction is complete.

This completes the proof for both the Cases. $\square$

4 Acknowledgement

I wish to thank V. S. Sunder for many helpful discussions.

References

[1] Evans D. E., and Kawahigashi Y., Quantum symmetries on operator algebras, *Oxford Mathematical Monographs* The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998, Oxford Science Publications.

[2] Frederick M. Goodman, Pierre de La Harpe, and Vaughan F.R. Jones(1989), *Coxeter graphs and towers of algebras*, volume 14, Springer-Verlag New York.

[3] Gantmacher F.R., The theory of matrices, vol. 2, Chelsea, New York, 1959, *Mathematical Reviews (MathSciNet): MR99f*, 15001, 1979.

[4] Jolissaint P., Index for pairs of finite von Neumann algebras, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*,**146(1)**(1990) 43-70.

[5] Jones V.F.R., Index for subfactors, *Inventiones Mathematicae*, **72(1)**(1983) 1-25.

[6] Jones V.F.R. and Penneys D., The embedding theorem for finite depth subfactor planar algebras, *Quantum Topol.* **2** Issue (3)(2011) 301-337,

[7] Jones V.F.R. and Sunder,V.S., *Introduction to subfactors*, volume 234. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[8] Kawahigashi Y., Automorphisms commuting with a conditional expectation onto a subfactor with finite index, *J. Operator Theory*, **28**(1992) no. 1, 127-145.

[9] Kosaki H., Extension of Jones' theory on index to arbitrary factors *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **66**(1986) 123-140.

[10] Loi P. H., On automorphisms of subfactors, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **141**(2) (1996) 275-293.

[11] Pimsner M. and Popa S., Entropy and index for subfactors, In *Annales scientifiques de l'Ecole normale supérieure*, **19** (1986) 57-106.

[12] Pimsner M. and Popa S., Iterating the basic construction, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **310(1)** (1988) 127–133 .

[13] Richard D. Burstein, Group-type subfactors and Hadamard matrices, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*. **367**(2015) 6783-6807, see also *arXiv preprint arXiv:0811.1265*(2008)

[14] Svendsen A.L., Automorphisms of subfactors from commuting squares, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **356**(2004) no.6 2515-2543.

[15] Watatani,Y., Index for C^*-subalgebras, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **424**(1990) vi+117 pp.